

920602-99890

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

IN RE THE APPLICATION OF	)	
	)	
Robertson, Graham	)	Examiner: Madeline Gonzalez
	)	
SERIAL NO.: 10/543,042	)	Art Unit: 1772
	)	
FILED: July 21, 2005	)	Customer Number: 23644
	)	
FOR: Filtering Screen	)	Confirmation Number: 9184

**RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED OCTOBER 13, 2010**

Honorable Director of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This response is being filed in view of the Examiner's further and final Office Action of October 13, 2010. No amendments are being made as none are believed necessary.

Before turning to the Examiner's Office Action, the undersigned acknowledges that the Examiner is currently on maternity leave, and will not be returning until February. Before the Examiner acts further on this application, once returning to the Patent and Trademark Office, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to schedule an interview so that this application may move forward as expeditiously as possible.

Turning to the Examiner's Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 9 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Adams published application no. US 2002/0023833 or alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Adams. The remaining claims have been rejected on the basis of obviousness over Adams. Reconsideration is requested.

In the discussion of Adams on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner equates cloth 214 shown in Figure 19D of Adams with the support structure of the

present invention. This is submitted to be an unreasonable interpretation. Cloth 214 of Adams is not formed by a lattice of struts, as required by applicants' claims. In addition, cloth 214 does not function as a support.

Much more importantly, however, the Examiner appears to consider that the orientation of cloth 216 of Figure 19C of Adams in relation to cloth 214 of Figure 19D satisfies the requirement of the claims. This is not the case.

In Adams, cloths 216 and 214 are oriented so that the lengths of the rectangular openings in the two cloths extend in the same direction, i.e. they are aligned.

In contrast, in the present invention, the length of the rectangular openings in the cloth extends transversely to the length of the rectangular openings in the support, i.e. they do not extend in the same direction. This orientation is thus quite different from that in Adams. As applicants have explained previously at some length, this orientation forms the basis of, and is critical to, the present invention.

To illustrate this point, attached is an annotated copy of Figure 8 of the present application, showing the relationship that forms the basis of the invention. The attached annotated copy of Figures 19C and 19D of Adams show that the relationship in the prior art is quite different.

The Examiner also refers to the screens shown in Figures 4 to 13 (on page 6 of the Office Action), particularly Figure 11 (on page 3 of the action). These disclosures are of screens in isolation, not forming part of the structure of Figure 19, and have no information or teaching on the orientation of the screen relative to the "support". It is submitted that these figures are therefore irrelevant.

It is therefore submitted that the claims of the present application, as cast, patentably distinguish from the prior art and are allowable thereover. However, as noted initially above, if the Examiner is not prepared to allow the application once returning to it, a telephone interview is requested, and the Examiner is therefore urged to contact the undersigned to make appropriate arrangements.